

Serial No. 10/003,635

**REMARKS**

The Office action dated May 4, 2005 and the cited references have been carefully considered.

**Status of the Claims**

Claims 7-13 and 19-28 remain in the current prosecution. Claims 1-6 and 14-18 are withdrawn pursuant to an earlier election to prosecute claims 7-13 and 19-28 in the current prosecution.

Claims 7-13 and 19-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kunzler (U.S. Patent 5,710,302). Claims 7-11, 13, and 19-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Meijs (U.S. Patent 5,981,615). Claims 7-13 and 19-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Novicky (U.S. Patent 4,743,106). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meijs. The Applicants respectfully traverse all of these rejections for the reasons set forth below.

**Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 7-13 and 19-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kunzler. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Kunzler does not disclose each and every element of each of claims 7-13 and 19-28.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a *single* prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (emphasis added). Every element of the claimed invention must be *literally* present, arranged as in the claim. . . . The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

Kunzler discloses a monomer (represented by his Formula VI) wherein the radicals R<sub>19</sub>, which are attached to the Si atoms are either lower alkyl or phenyl radicals.

Serial No. 10/003,635

In contradistinction, amended claim 7 and all claims dependent therefrom recite a siloxysilane wherein the side groups  $R_1$  linked to the Si atoms are selected from the group consisting of  $C_{6-36}$  aryl ether,  $C_{6-36}$  heterocycle,  $C_{6-36}$  heterocycle with one or more substituents,  $C_{1-10}$  alkyl ether and  $C_{6-36}$  aryloxy. Thus, Kunzler does not disclose each and every element of each of claims 7-13 and 19-28.

Since Kunzler does not disclose each and every element of each of claims 7-13 and 19-28, Kunzler does not anticipate these claims.

Claims 7-11, 13, and 19-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Meijs. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Meijs does not disclose each and every element of each of claims 7-11, 13, and 19-28.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a *single* prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (emphasis added). Every element of the claimed invention must be *literally* present, arranged as in the claim. . . . The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

Meijs discloses a monomer (Formula IVA, as cited by the Examiner) wherein the side groups of the PDMS block are lower alkyl radicals of up to 8 carbon atoms (see column 4, lines 16-18).

In contradistinction, amended claim 7 and all claims dependent therefrom recite a siloxysilane wherein the side groups  $R_1$  linked to the Si atoms are selected from the group consisting of  $C_{6-36}$  aryl ether,  $C_{6-36}$  heterocycle,  $C_{6-36}$  heterocycle with one or more substituents,  $C_{1-10}$  alkyl ether and  $C_{6-36}$  aryloxy. Thus, Meijs does not disclose each and every element of each of claims 7-11, 13, and 19-28.

Since Meijs does not disclose each and every element of each of claims 7-11, 13, and 19-28, Meijs does not anticipate these claims.

Serial No. 10/003,635

Claims 7-13 and 19-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Novicky. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Novicky does not disclose each and every element of each of claims 7-13 and 19-28.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a *single* prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (emphasis added). Every element of the claimed invention must be *literally* present, arranged as in the claim. . . . The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

Novicky discloses a monomer wherein the side groups (as represented by "A") are C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>8</sub> alkyl or phenyl. See column 1, line 65 to column 4, line 27.

In contradistinction, amended claim 7 and all claims dependent therefrom recite a siloxysilane wherein the radicals R<sub>1</sub> linked to the Si atoms are selected from the group consisting of C<sub>6-36</sub> aryl ether, C<sub>6-36</sub> heterocycle, C<sub>6-36</sub> heterocycle with one or more substituents, C<sub>1-10</sub> alkyl ether and C<sub>6-36</sub> aryloxy. Thus, Novicky does not disclose each and every element of each of claims 7-13, and 19-28.

Since Novicky does not disclose each and every element of each of claims 7-13, and 19-28, Novicky does not anticipate these claims.

#### **Claim Rejection Under 35 C.F.R. § 103(a)**

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meijs. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Meijs does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 12.

"To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 (8<sup>th</sup> ed., Rev. 2, May 2004).

Serial No. 10/003,635

As pointed out above, Meijs does not disclose the side groups  $R_1$ , as recited in amended claim 7 and all claims dependent therefrom. In addition, Meijs does not suggest these side groups. Therefore, Meijs does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 12.

Since Meijs does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 12, Meijs does not render this claim unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested. Allowance of claims at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Toan P. Vo, Ph.D.  
Attorney for the applicants  
Registration No. 43,225  
(585)338-8071

Rochester, New York  
August 1, 2005